



WEB COPY IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06.02.2024

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRL.OP No. 14220 of 2022 &
Crl.MP.Nos.7777 of 2022

1 T.RAJESH

...Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE REP BY ITS THE INSPECT
OR OF POLICE ANTI LAND GRABING SPECIAL CELL
THIRUVANNAMALAI DISTRICT. (P.R.C.NO.29 OF
2014)

2 S.RAMARAJ

...Respondent

PRAYER : This petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records relating to P.R.C No.29 of 2014 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1 Thiruvannamalai and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Shivakumar
For R1 : Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar,
Government Advocate
(Crl. Side)

**ORDER**

The petitioner herein filed this petition to call for the records relating to P.R.C No.29 of 2014 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.1 Thiruvannamalai and quash the same.

2. The defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that the land in Survey No. 145/1-C, 150/1, 150/2, 1502-B to totaling to 3.32 acres at Aathipadi Village, Thandrampet Taluk was originally belongs to A1/Ramaanakannan and after alienation of the same to the petitioner/vendor the said accused No. 1 again resold the property by way of impersonation in the name of petitioner's vendor with the aid of Malliga/A2, Anthony/A3, Ashok Kumar/A4, Murugan/A6 and Jeyavel/A7. Hence, the complaint was lodged by the defacto complainant after investigation the petitioner was impleaded as A5 and the final report was modified for the offence under Section 120(b), 419, 420, 423, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC and Section 3(i) (v) of SC & ST (POA) Act and the same was taken on file by the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvannamalai in PRC No. 29 of 2014.

3. Heard both sides.



4. As per the final report in respect of the petitioner the respondent police have not find any transactions stands in the name of the petitioner.

Furthermore, the above said property was sold by the Ramakannan to Ravi and thereafter said Ravi sold the same to the Randhabhai in turn the said Radhabai sold the property to Rajesh again the said Rajesh sold the same to the defacto complainant on 22.01.2021. But on seeing the facts of the case, the said Ramanakannam/A1 after executing the document, created the forged document for the very same property by impersonating Malliga as Radhabai and executed the sale deed through fabricated power of attorney. Hence, there is no incriminating material against this petitioner to show that he fabricated the document in collusion with the accused persons. Further, defacto complainant filed the affidavit stating that the petitioner had not indulged in the above said offence. Hence, P.R.C No.29 of 2014 is hereby quashed in respect of this petitioner.

5. In the result, this petition is allowed. No Costs. Consequentially, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

06.02.2024

pbl



WEB COPY



4

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

pbl

To

1.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

2. The Judicial Magistrate No.1 Thiruvannamalai.

CRL.OP No. 14220 of 2022
& CrI.MP.No. 7777 of 2022

06.02.2024